

claims are fully supported by the specification as originally filed, and no new matter has been added. The amendments are made to clarify the claims and are not intended to limit the scope of equivalents to which any claim element may be entitled. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the amendments above and the remarks that follow.

Specification

A new Abstract is presented on a separate sheet attached hereto, as required.

The objections with respect to the item numbering on page 11 of the disclosure have been corrected herein, as required.

Drawings

Figures 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 16 are corrected to remove the reference signs that are not mentioned in the specification. The corrections are summarized below:

In Figure 9, the following reference numbers have been removed: 902, 904, 906 and 907.

In Figure 10, the following reference numbers have been removed: 1062, 1070, and 1072.

In Figure 11, the following reference numbers have been removed: 1150, 1152, 1164, 1170, 1172, 1178, and 1180.

In Figure 12, the following reference numbers have been removed: 1250, 1252, 1262, 1270, 1272, 1274, 1276, 1278, and 1280.

In Figure 14, the following reference numbers have been removed: 1486, 1488, 1489.

In Figure 15, the following reference numbers have been removed : 1587, 1588, 1589, 1592 and 1593.

In Figure 16, the following reference numbers have been removed 1686, 1688, 1689, 1690, 1691, 1692, and 1693.

Also enclosed is a red-lined copy of Figure 11 of the drawings showing proposed amendments to in red ink. The reference numerals 1154 and 1156 have been clarified so that they do not appear to read 1054 and 1056.

Claim Objections

The Examiner's objection to "tack" in the 6th line of Claim 6 is noted. The words "in tack" have been changed to read --intact-- by amendment presented above.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Galles et al. (US 5,669,008).

Anticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. *In re Dillon* 919 F.2d 688, 16 USPQ 2d 1897, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (en banc), cert. denied, 500 U.S. 904 (1991). Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action did not make out a *prima facie* case of anticipation.

Amended claim 1 recites "wherein if one of the metarouters is coupled to one of the first level routers, then the one of the metarouters is also coupled to less than two other metarouters, otherwise the one of the metarouters is coupled to two metarouters." In contrast, Galles describes and shows only topologies in which the routers in the second-level metacube are always connected to routers in the first-level hypercube. Thus, Galles does not teach each element of claim 1 because Galles does not teach or show that if metarouters are coupled to one of the first level routers, then the metarouters are also coupled to zero or one other metarouters, *otherwise the metarouters are coupled to two metarouters and no first level routers*.

Likewise, amended claim 6 and new independent claim 7 recite that "less than all of the routers in the second set of routers are coupled to a router in the first set of routers." As stated above, Galles describes and shows only topologies in which all of the routers in the second-level metacube are connected to routers in the first-level hypercube. Thus, Galles does not teach each element of claims 6 or 7 because Galles does not teach or show that "*less than all* of the routers in the second set of routers are coupled to a router in the first set of routers."

Claims 2 and 4 are dependent on claim 1, and are patentable over Galles for the reasons argued above, plus the elements in the claims.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 102 and allowance of claim 1, 2, 4 and 6.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 3 and 5 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Galles et al. (US 5,669,008). Claims 3 and 5 depend, directly or indirectly, on claim 1, and are patentable over Galles for the reasons argued above, plus the elements in the claims. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 103 and allowance of claims 3 and 5.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (612-349-9592) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

MARTIN M. DENEROFF ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 349-9592

Date Aug. 26, 2002 By Ann M. McCrackin
Ann M. McCrackin
Reg. No. 42,858

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on this 26th day of August, 2002.

ANN MCCRACKIN
Name

Ann M. McCrackin
Signature



TITLE: NETWORK TOPOLOGY FOR A SCALABLE PROCESSOR SYSTEM
INVENTORS NAME: Martin M. Deneron et al.
SERIAL NO.: 09/408,972

9/15

RECEIVED
SEP 09 2002
Technology Center 2100




Fig. 11